REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner's first rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne, Jr. (US 5,891,189) in view of Kuo et al. (US 5,148,002). The applicant disagrees with this rejection, as noted below.

It would not be obvious to combine Kuo et al. with Payne, Jr. in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Kuo et al. deals with items of clothing and does not deal with a heating element incorporated into a belt. Therefore, the two cited prior art references are too different to be combined in the manner suggested. Therefore, the applicant believes she has traversed this basis for rejection, and thus, the applicant asks that the Examiner allow claim 1 of the present invention.

Examiner's second rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne, Jr. (US 5,891,189) in view of Kuo et al. (US 5,148,002), and further in view of Cole, III, et al. (US 5,973,603) and Jones, III (US 5,866,881). The applicant disagrees with this rejection, as noted below.

The mere fact that four separate prior art references are needed to somehow show "obviousness" clearly indicates, on its face alone, that claim 2 is nonobvious in lieu of the prior art. It is hard to believe that an individual with "average skill in the art to which the invention pertains" actually would come across all four of these prior art references and utilize them in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Examiner's third rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne, Jr. (US 5,891,189) in view of Kuo et al. (US 5,148,002), and further in view of Cole, III, et al. (US 5,973,603) , Jones, III (US 5,866,881), and Bloodworth (US 6,329,638). The applicant disagrees with this rejection, as noted below.

The mere fact that five separate prior art references are needed to somehow show "obviousness" clearly indicates, on its face alone, that claims 3-4 are nonobvious in lieu of the prior art. It is hard to believe that an individual with "average skill in the art to which the invention pertains" actually would come across all five of these prior art references and utilize them in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Examiner's fourth rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne, Jr. (US 5,891,189) in view of Kuo et al. (US 5,148,002), and further in view of Cole, III, et al. (US 5,973,603) , Jones, III (US 5,866,881), Bloodworth (US 6,329,638), and Sato (US 4,533,821). The applicant disagrees with this rejection, as noted below.

The mere fact that six separate prior art references are needed to somehow show "obviousness" clearly indicates, on its face alone, that claim 5 is nonobvious in lieu of the prior art. It is hard to believe that an individual with "average skill in the art to which the invention pertains" actually would come across all six of these prior art references and utilize them in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above-described reasons, applicant submits that the specifications and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims define patentability over the prior art. In addition, applicant believes that her arguments in the "Remarks" section successfully traverses the objections and rejections brought forth by the Examiner in the Office Action. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action she respectfully solicits. If the Examiner feels that some of the dependent claims are allowable, the Applicant asks the Examiner to allow the Applicant to make any amendments to the allowed claims to incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew J. Peirce, Esq.
Registration No. #41,245
Attorney for Inventor Luree Tobin